

28 JUN 1978

100-13-2425

Pro Leg

MEMORANDUM FOR: Legislative Counsel

ATTENTION:

Assistant Legislative Counsel

STAT

FROM:

Harry E. Fitzwater
Director of Training

SUBJECT:

Special Retirement and Training Legislation

REFERENCE:

Memo fm ALC, dtd 22 May 78, Same Subject

1. As requested in the referent memorandum, following are the Office of Training's comments on the proposed special legislation, and on the questions contained in your memorandum.

2. In the proposed legislation, paragraph (a), it is recommended that the intention of the Agency to fund the external training be clearly spelled out. It is suggested that a phrase such as "be reimbursed for" be substituted for the word "receive" in this paragraph.

3. The following comments are keyed to the questions posed in paragraph 2 of reference: Questions a and b -- Cost of such a proposed program, and number of persons eligible for the training are difficult to estimate without a projection from the Office of Personnel on the scope of any future reductions in force in the Agency. For illustrative purposes, we have assumed that a total of 100 employees could be involved in the program and arbitrarily assigned 50 to an academic year at a local university, and 50 to various types of short courses, e.g., correspondence courses, Government programs, and programs in the private sector. Using George Washington University's tuition cost as a yardstick, the estimated cost would be \$135,000 for the first category, and utilizing an average cost of \$300 to \$800 for the other block of 50, costs would approximate \$27,500, for a total estimate of \$162,500. This averages to \$1,625 per person for a nine-month academic year.

SUBJECT: Special Retirement and Training Legislation

4. Question c -- We envision no additional security problems as the employees will be carried on Agency rolls, albeit not against ceiling. We also presume employees would retain their cover status for the period of the special training.

5. Questions d and e -- It is our opinion that the proposed training benefits should apply to all employees across the board. We believe it would be difficult to distinguish or single out those who have "non-marketable skills."

6. Question g -- Had this authority been available at the time of the recent Directorate of Operations reduction in force, these employees could have been eligible for such training.

7. Question h -- Retroactive applicability is desirable and a period of one year is suggested as the guideline. Additionally, there should be a time limit on notice of separation from the Agency and the start of training.

Harry E. Fitzwater

STAT